שבלת, ישראלי, רוברטס, זיסמן ושות'

SHIBOLETH

SHIBOLETH YISRAELI ROBERTS ZISMAN & Co.
ADVOCATES, NOTARIES & PATENT ATTORNEYS

Lior Aviram
Helena Bellin
Ohad Ben-Dror
Ron Ben-Menachem
Moty Ben Yona
David Bernheim
Miri Bickel
Ruth Dagan
Keren Dinar
Amir Fisher
Stanley Frisch
Almog Geva
Michal Gottesman-Barak
Avinoam M. Gottlieb
Dov Govrin
Elad Greiner
Ohad Har-Lev
Rotem Harari
Miriam Heller Lidji
Hillel Ish-Shalom
Benny Kalifi

Dr. Yuval Karniel
Maya Klaiman
Yariv Kesner
Roy Kubovsky
Edward Langer
Tirza Less-Gross
Rinat Lanlado
Ofer Manor
Yehuda Mualem
Michael B. Nussbaum
Shlomit Ophir-Harel
Gadi Ouzan
Limor Pelad
Dana Raucher
Linda Reiss-Wolicki
Richard M. Roberts
Ofer Shapira
Amnon Shiboleth
Orit Sternhell-Zaltzman
Yaacov Yisraeli
Itzhak Zisman

TEL AVIV OFFICE
42 Montefiore St., Tel Aviv 65201, Israel, Tel: (972)3-7103911, Fax: (972)3-7103922

RAANANA OFFICE
315 Giron Center, P. O. B. 410,Raanana 43103, Israel, Tel: (972)9-7713585, Fax: (972)9-7713593

NEW YORK OFFICE
Empire State Building , 350 Fifth Avenue, 60th Floor, New York, N.Y. 10118, Tel: (212)244-4111, Fax: (212)563-7108

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
EDWARD LANGER B.S.E.E., M.B.A., J.D., Adv. & Patent Attorney (Israel Bar), Reg. US Pat. Attorney (Penns/Vania Bar)
e-mail: e.langer@shiboleth.com

Tel-Aviv, October 17, 2005

BY FAX (571) 273-8300

Commissioner of Patents
US Patent Office, POB 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313
Attn: Examiner Lloyd A. Gall

URGENT

Re: U.S. Patent Application entitled:
METHOD AND ASSEMBLY TO PREVENT IMPACT-DRIVEN MANIPULATION OF CYLINDER LOCKS
Inventor(s): Moshe DOLEV
Application No.: 10/630,916 Filed: July 31, 2003
Our Ref: 1703

Dear Examiner Gall,

This letter is to confirm our meeting in your office on Monday. October 31 at 12:00 PM. We have received the Final Office Action dated July 18, 2005, indicating claim 21 is allowable.

The inventor intends to be at the meeting, and to demonstrate a model of the invention (not yet seen).

In advance of the meeting, I would like to summarize the important points of differentiation between the present invention and the cited Stemmerik reference.

As you will recall, in our earlier discussion, it was noted that the Stemmerick reference describes a driver pin divided into two portions, 10 and 11. It is stated that only portion no. 10 moves in response to the impact, while portion 11 remains in place, see col. 3 lines 13 through 16.

This is also stated in the Stemmerick ref. at col 1, line 65:

"the stroke towards the tumbler pin is transmitted to the driver pin which is thereby lifted without any actual movement of the tumbler pin. By the arrangement according to the invention, the effect of the impact is transmitted through the movable member which constitutes one part of the driver pin".

Applicant maintains his earlier position that this statement is inaccurate, as the physical forces act on both the pins. The Examiner maintains that this is of no patentable signifance concerning the instant claims.

In any case, further analysis of the Stemmerick reference reveals the statement, at col. 3, line 28:

"to increase the security against the member 11 moving in spite of the impact energy being transmitted to the movable member 10, the member 11 may have a closer tolerance (tighter fit) in the associated bore

שבלת, ישראלי, רוברטס, זיסמן ושות'
SHIBOLETH
SHIBOLETH YISRAELI ROBERTS ZISMAN & Co.
ADVOCATES & NOTARIES עורכי דין ונוטריונים

than that of the remaining driver pins. In this way a friction between this driver pin and the bore is ensured."

This feature of Stemmerick is recited in claim 1 where it is stated:

"...wherein at least one driver pin consisting of two members has a closer tolerance ..."

From the above, it appears that the Stemmerick solution defines a frictional relationship with the bore.

In contrast, with respect to the present invention, as stated at p. 12, line 10 of the specification, it is clearly explained that both the tumbler pins and the driver pins move from their locking positions, but in the case of the modified pin assembly the driver pin 78 moves less than the standard driver pin, 54 and consequently the shear line is still blocked (p. 12, line 25 through p. 13 line 2).

In Figure 19, it is explained that even if the intensity is greater than the normal intensity used to unlock the lock in Figure 18, the driver pin in chamber T is displaced, however the tumbler pin which is the longest tumbler pin in this lock, is displaced so as to reach and block the shear line.

In the amendment filed May 17, 2005, the language of claims 1 and 11 was amended to recite a modified pin assembly, provided with motion alteration means adapted to alter the magnitude of its response to an impact-driven blow applied to the tumbler pin.

In view of the above analysis regarding the frictional relationship defined by Stemmerick, Applicant proposes to further modify the language of claims 1 and 11 to indicate that the inventive motion alteration means does not rely on a frictional relationship of the modified pin set in establishing its displacement.

Based on the attached proposal, it is the Applicant's position that claims 1 and 11 distinguish over the cited Stemmerick reference, and the present invention should be granted a patent.

The attached proposal contains the proposed amended claims only, without the Remarks section.

Since these amended claims 1 and 11 are generic, the patent would also include all the claims to embodiments of the non-elected species. For these claims, also attached is a proposal (Appendix "A") of amendments to the claims containing the non-elected species, specifically claims 2, 4-8, 12, and 14-18.

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss these matters.

Sincerely,

Edward Langer
Reg. No. 30, 564